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ABSTRACT
The present study examines selected speeches of a non-Western leading politician as an attempt to widen the scope of rhetorical studies from different cultures and to address the lack of studies from non-Western societies. The study conducts a rhetorical analysis of selected speeches of Mahathir Mohamad (the fourth Prime Minister of Malaysia) to identify and interpret his language use as a means to persuade his audience to accept or follow a specific course of action. This study explores logos, ethos, and pathos as a means of persuasion demonstrating how they are utilized by Mahathir Mohamad to influence his audience. The findings revealed that logical, ethical and emotional proofs were used for this purpose. Together logos and pathos projected Mahathir’s ethos, that is, his credibility as a person, as a persuasive mean. Supportive rhetorical techniques such as examples, parallelisms, rhetorical questions and metaphors were used to enhance Mahathir’s argument and to add clarity and conciseness to the argument.
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INTRODUCTION
The study of rhetoric and persuasion should be encouraged because our society can profit from a general awareness of persuasion as a mode of social change and influence. Lessl (2005) emphasizes the importance of rhetoric because the study of rhetoric helps us to understand the processes of communication which underpin making decisions. He adds that understanding the rhetoric of a society tells us about its culture, beliefs, ideas, and assumptions. The recent period has witnessed an interest among researchers to understand the nature of rhetoric and the application of rhetorical techniques in persuasion. However, the study of rhetoric does not cover all societies; it still focuses on the West today. This focus of rhetorical studies on the West has created a lack of knowledge about the rhetorical techniques and the ways of argumentation in non-Western communities. This study is a modest attempt to address the lack of rhetorical studies from the non-Western societies. It is designed to examine how language is utilized by a prominent non-Western orator as a means of
persuasion. In this study, persuasion is understood as the speaker’s attempts to influence his audience and it can be achieved through honesty, transparency, respect, appreciation and activation but not through deception. Perloff (1993, p.15) for example defines persuasion as “an activity or a process in which a communicator attempts to induce a change in the belief, attitude, or behavior of another person or group of persons through the transmission of a message in a context in which the persuadee has some degree of free choice.”

OBJECTIVES
The major interest of this study is to investigate the rhetorical devices utilized by Dr. Mahathir to persuade his audience. It intends to examine the persuasive devices: logos, ethos, and pathos as tools of persuasion, illustrating how they are employed to attain the persuasive effect. Specifically, the study aims to address the following research questions:

a. How are logos, ethos and pathos utilized in the speeches of Dr Mahathir as a means of persuasion?

b. Which mode of persuasion functions as a central device in his speeches?

LITERATURE REVIEW
Rhetoric
Rhetoric has been defined by scholars in different ways. Aristotle (trans. by Roberts, 2007, p. 5) defines rhetoric as “the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion”. Cicero (cited in Gill and Whedbee 1997, p. 157), defines rhetoric as “the art of speaking well – that is to say, with knowledge, skill and elegance” while Whately (1963, p. 39) defines rhetoric as “the finding of suitable arguments to prove a given point, and the skillful arrangement of them”. Bryant (1972, p.26) sees rhetoric as “the process of adjusting ideas to people and people to idea”, and Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005,p. 3) define rhetoric broadly as “the art of discourse” or more precisely as “the art of persuasive discourse”.

Aristotle classifies three essential means of persuasion, namely, logos, ethos and pathos. They are known as the three appeals of persuasion. Aristotle sees them central to any orator to influence and persuade his audience. Further clarification of these three modes of persuasion is provided below.

Logos
Simply, logos is the logical proof provided by the speaker for his audience. It is based on reasons. Roberts (2004) views logos as what makes the argument of an orator’s speech demonstrative and credible. Lunsford and Cheryle (1999, p. 175) describe logos as “appeals to reason of the message itself with all facts reflecting and affecting the universe”. These definitions assert the importance of providing reasons and proofs, describing logos as a message that includes facts and evidence difficult to dispute. Sheldon (2004) also emphasizes that logical argument should be grounded on and supported by facts, testimonies and rationality.

Logos can be supported by some rhetorical techniques for instance enthymemes, examples, rhetorical questions, parallelisms, metaphors and repetitions. Enthymeme, according to Corbett and Connors (1999), is seen as an argumentative statement that contains only one probable premise that leads to a tentative conclusion. The other premise is implied. Zarefsky (2008, p. 163) defines examples as “specific instances that are used to illustrate a more general claim; the inference is that the specific is typical of the general”. A rhetorical
question is also used as a persuasive tool to trigger the audience’s critical thinking. Verderber et al. (2009, p. 76) see rhetorical questions as “questions phrased to stimulate a mental response rather than an actual spoken response on the part of the audience”. They claim that rhetorical questions create common ground by alluding to information which is familiar or shared by the speaker and the audience. Other supportive techniques such as statistics, parallelisms, and repetitions can also be employed by orators to add conciseness, vividness, and clarity to the argument.

**Ethos**

Ethos depends on the character of the speaker. It refers to the speaker’s trustworthiness and his ability to satisfy his audience that he is credible. Ethos is based on how the speaker is regarded by his audience. Ethical appeal is created when the speech itself impresses the audience that the speaker is of high moral character, benevolence and a person of sound sense (Corbett, 1990).

Aristotle, as translated by Roberts (2004), states that persuasion is achieved by the speaker’s character when he speaks in a way that makes us think he is credible. The character of the speaker is evaluated by his ideas and by what he says not by his previous reputation before he speaks. To clarify how orators gain their audience’s confidence, Aristotle offers three core qualities for an orator to create his ethical proofs for persuasion:

For the orator to produce conviction three qualities are necessary: for independently of demonstration, the qualities are good sense, virtue and goodwill; for speakers are wrong both in what they say and the advice they give, because they lack either all three or one of them. For either through want of sense they form incorrect opinions, or if their opinions are correct, through viciousness they do not say what they think, or if they are sensible and good, they lack goodwill; therefore it may happen that they do not give the best advice, although they know what it is. These qualities are all that are necessary, so the speaker appears to possess all three will necessarily convince the hearers (Aristotle in Hall, 2001, p. 29).

Hall (2001, p. 29) adds that Aristotle defined good sense (practical wisdom) as “a virtue of reason, which enables men to come to a wise decision in regard to good or evil things.” Aristotle notes that the audience is able to evaluate the speaker’s good sense through assessing the content of the speech. The speech provides the hearers with some hints and alerts them about the speaker’s understanding of the subject being addressed and his capacity to support his ideas with logical reasons and proofs. Corbett (1990) suggests that if a discourse were to exhibit a speaker’s good sense, it must demonstrate the speaker’s competence and adequate awareness of the subject being talked about; it must show that the speaker knows the principles of valid reasoning and has good taste of discriminating judgment.

Aristotle (cited in Roberts 1996, unpaginated), defines virtue as “a faculty of providing and preserving good things, a faculty productive of many and great benefits, in fact, of all things in all cases”. Thomas et al. (2005) see that good moral character is the attribute of ‘virtue’ which takes the form of justice, courage, temperance, gentleness, prudence and wisdom. Goodwill is a quality which is important for persuasion. A speaker should show his friendship and what he believes to be good. Corbett (1990) claims that in order to reflect the speaker’s goodwill, the discourse should display his sincere interest in the welfare of his audience and a readiness to sacrifice any self-interest that conflicts with the benefit of others. In general, a speaker can create his ethical proofs through reflecting a good image about
himself. He should be able to demonstrate sincerely that he is well-informed, reasonable, clearheaded, sincere, concerned about the welfare of others and knowledgeable in order to gain his audience’s confidence.

**Pathos**

Pathos is a persuasive mode based on emotion. It is the emotional proofs by which the speaker attempts to arouse the audience’s feeling in order to encourage them to perform a specific action. Aristotle (cited in Hall, 2001, pp. 32-33) defines emotions as “all those affections which cause men to change their opinion in regard to their judgments, and accompanied by pleasure and pain such as anger, pity, fear and all similar emotions and their contraries.” He believes that affections cause people to change their judgments. Therefore, it is very important for the orator to be able to trigger his listeners’ emotions to achieve his goal. Osborn et al. (2009) note that people always respond strongly when they feel angry, guilty, excited, or compassionate towards others. Al-Osaimi (1990) also notes that logical argument is useless if it does not produce emotional arousal. He asserts that there is nowhere in rhetoric Aristotle mentions that “logos” alone, “pathos” alone or “ethos” alone is a sufficient condition for persuasion. Rather, Aristotle emphasizes the interrelatedness of logos, pathos and ethos to accomplish persuasion.

It is also emphasized that realizing the audience’s emotional state helps orators to achieve his persuasive goal. Aristotle (cited in Cockcroft and Cockcroft, 2005) notes that orators have to understand the listeners’ emotional state in advance so that they know what kind of feelings they want their listeners to experience. Furthermore, Sheldon (2004) claims that the speaker should know in advance whether he wants his listeners to experience a feeling of anger, empathy, compassion or resentment. It could be concluded that emotions should be used as an effective tool to change people’s beliefs and be persuasive.

**Related Studies**

The three modes of persuasion, logos, ethos and pathos, have been examined by different studies to reveal their role in persuasion and how they are employed to influence people. Al-Osaimi (1990), for instance, conducted a critical discourse analysis of selected speeches of Faisal Ibn Abdulazis, the King of Saudi Arabia, to explore the persuasive techniques in his oratory. The study aimed to examine the most dominant persuasive means Faisal used and what can be inferred from these techniques about his oration. The findings revealed that he tended to balance all modes of proofs and his rhetoric relied heavily on the Quran. Another study was by Paris (2004) who carried out a discourse analysis to examine post September 11, 2001 rhetoric of President Bush in order to evaluate the persuasive techniques Bush’s speech writers used and to propose an explanation of what Bush said and how his techniques were psychologically persuasive. The findings suggested that persuasiveness was based on appeals to emotions, mainly fear, rhetorical techniques, fallacies of critical thinking, and appeals to the unconscious. Rowland and Jones (2007) analysed Obama’s speech which was delivered in the 2004 Democratic National Convention and found all three modes, logos, ethos and pathos employed in the speech. The study asserted that Obama created narratives that balanced personal and societal values and made the American dream accessible to liberals. His rhetoric emphasized the American dream and that the Americans were on a progressive journey to a better society.

**METHODOLOGY**

This qualitative study aims to provide an in-depth analysis of the discourse in two selected speeches of Dr. Mahathir from the perspective of persuasion. A rhetorical analysis was conducted to examine logos, ethos, and pathos as persuasive devices and how they are
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employed for persuasive effects. It also explores which persuasive mode Dr. Mahathir relies on as a central device to accomplish persuasion. The two speeches, which were delivered in English, were selected from the speeches delivered at international conferences. The selection of the speeches was made according to the importance of the conference and the theme of the speech. The indicators of the importance of the conference include internationality, the objectives of the conference as well as the ranks and positions of the attendees. The indicators of the importance of the theme include issues and obstacles that need resolutions pertinent to people’s life such as wars, peace, terrorism, insecurity etc. The selected speeches are described below:

Speech 1: Delivered on 16 October 2003 at the Opening of Islamic Conference (OIC) in Putrajaya, Malaysia. (length 4259 words)

Speech 2: Delivered on 5 February 2007 at the War Criminal Conference at Dewan Merdeka, PWTC, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. (length 5453 words)

Table 1 illustrates the analytical framework which is drawn from the insights of Aristotle’s understanding of persuasion supported with work by Sheldon (2004), Hauser (2002), Crowley and Hawhee (1999), Corbett and Connors (1999) and Corbett (1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical devices</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logical Mode (Logos)</td>
<td>Logos can be seen through the speaker’s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- facts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- enthymemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- rhetorical questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- statements from authorities as proofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- syllogism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- eye-witnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in order to reach a valid conclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Mode (Ethos)</td>
<td>Ethos is embedded in the messages sent by the speaker. It can be seen through the speaker’s credibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The speaker can achieve his credibility when he reflects in his messages the qualities of:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Good sense. This can be done when the speaker:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- demonstrates that he is competent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- knowledgeable about the addressed issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- illustrate that he is clearheaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- well-informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Good moral character (manifesting beliefs and values). The speaker should be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- even-handed and unbiased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- straightforward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- reasonable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Goodwill. The speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- shows that he is sincere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- shows that he is concerned of the welfare of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- wishes others what is good for him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Emotional Mode (Pathos)

Pathos is a persuasive means based on emotion. In pathos the speaker attempts to:
- stir the hearer’s emotions
- make the listener experience specific kind of feeling that coincides with the ongoing situation.
- arouse feelings such as empathy, anger, sorrow, compassion, fear, love, pride.

(Source: Aristotle trans by Roberts, 2004; Sheldon, 2004; Hauser, 2002; Crowley & Hawhee, 1999; Corbett & Connors 1999; Corbett, 1990)

FINDINGS

This part presents the data and describes how logos, ethos, and pathos are employed as rhetorical devices to persuade the audience. Extracts from Dr. Mahathir’s speeches are presented to demonstrate how the devices are utilized for the intended purpose.

Logical mode (logos)

In Extract 1, Dr. Mahathir calls for the people not to antagonize everyone. He provides the listeners with some instructions and advice to persuade them to judge and deal with other people wisely. He addresses his listeners logically by presenting some facts and claims, for instance, in Line 1, he claims that, “not all non-Muslims are against us but some are well-disposed towards us.” From the few sentences at the beginning of the paragraph, Dr. Mahathir attempts to advise his audience to be logical when they evaluate others, they should not generalize that everyone is their enemy. Dr. Mahathir does not even exclude the Jews when he said in Line 2-3, “even among the Jews there are many who disapprove what is done by the Israelis”. This implies that although the Jews are the Muslims’ enemies, the Muslims cannot and should not fully generalize that all of them are against the Muslims. He calls the audience to be logical and fair.

Extract 1 (Speech 1)

1 We also know that not all non-Muslims are against us. Some are well-disposed towards us. Some even see our enemies as their enemies. Even among the Jews there are many who do not approve of what the Israelis are doing. We must not antagonize everyone. We must win their hearts and minds. We must win them to our side not by begging for help from them but by the honourable way that we struggle to help ourselves. We must not strengthen the enemy by pushing everyone into their camps through irresponsible and unIslamic acts. Remember SalahEl Din and the way he fought against the so called Crusaders, King Richard of England in particular. Remember the considerateness of the Prophet to the enemies of Islam. We must do the same. It is winning the struggle that is important, not angry retaliation, not revenge.
2 We must build up our strength in every field, not just in armed might. Our countries must be stable and well administered, must be economically and financially strong, industrially competent and technologically advanced.
3 This will take time, but it can be done and it will be time well spent. We are enjoined by our religion to be patient. Innallahamaasabirin. Obviously there is virtue in being patient.
Dr. Mahathir supports his claim by emphasizing the importance of winning people’s hearts and minds as an ideal way to success. In Line 4, he says, “we must win people’s hearts and minds” as an attempt to show his resentment and rejection for terrorism. He consolidates his rejection for terrorism when he denies and disapproves that terrorism is Islamic in Line 7, saying, irresponsible acts are unIslamic and strengthen the enemies than to weaken them.

As a successful endeavour to enhance his argument and to advance a logical proof, Dr. Mahathir brings in two rhetorical examples from the Islamic history as evidence for his claims when he says in Line 8, “Remember Salah El Din and the way he fought against the so called Crusaders,” and when he said in Lines 9-10, “Remember the considerateness of the Prophet to the enemies of Islam”.

Crowley and Howhee (2004, p. 37) quote Quintilian who defines a rhetorical example as “some past action real or assumed which may serve to persuade the audience of the truth of the point which we are trying to make.” They add that Aristotle emphasizes and points out that successful example may be drawn from history since they call up the memories of some events that the audience has already experienced and still remember. For instance, people who opposed the Gulf war in 1991 used the historical example of Vietnam to argue that America should not be involved again in a localized quarrel in which America had no direct involvement.

In Extract 1, Dr. Mahathir reminds his listeners to take good examples from the behaviour of the Prophet Mohamed and SalahEl Din. He calls the audience to revive the Prophet and Salah El Din history when they peacefully dealt with their enemies. Dr. Mahathir also uses different techniques to support his logical argument, whereby he employs parallelism when he says, “we must win their hearts….., we must win them to our side …., we must not strengthen the enemy” in Lines 4, 5 and 6 respectively to make his argument more concise as a way to persuade and encourage his listeners to perform the actions he suggests.

In addition, Devito (2006), views that the utilization of a parallel pattern can serve as facilitating comprehension and making the message memorable. Dr. Mahathir also uses parallelism in Lines 13-14 as a rhetorical device to reinforce his argument when he says, “economically and financially strong, industrially competent and technologically advanced”. Furthermore, he uses parallel adverbs and adjectives to introduce his ideas in a more effective way to increase persuasiveness in his argument. Repetition is also used by Dr. Mahathir in Lines 8-10 when he repeats the use of the imperative verb “remember”. He utilizes repetition to emphasize the intended message and makes his claims obvious.

Fairclough (1989) states that there is an internal relationship between language and social events. Hence, when people speak, listen or write, they do that in ways, which are affected socially. In a general sense, Dr. Mahathir’s rhetoric is not isolated from the social events that were present when this speech was delivered. Notably, terrorism has been rampantly occurring since the attacks of the World Trade Centre and Pentagon. After the attacks of 11 September 2001, the media conveyed a bad impression of Islam, accusing Islam as a religion of extremism particularly after Al-Qaida claimed responsibility for the attacks. Since the September attacks, many instances of terrorism, such as suicidal bombings, were committed by Al-Qaida in different countries around the world, including Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Iraq, and Britain. In the extract above, Dr. Mahathir also highlights the problem of terrorism by providing his audience with advice in Lines 4-5, “We must not antagonize everyone. We must win their hearts and minds. We must win them to our side”.

The utilization of Dr. Mahathir’s persuasive devices is connected to social context. He employs examples from the history of Islam as a way to condemn terrorism as a social event and to persuade his audience to behave peacefully according to the true Islamic principles. These rhetorical examples can be seen in Lines 8-9 when he says, “remember SalahEl Din and the way he fought against the so called Crusaders” and “remember the
considerateness of the Prophet to the enemies of Islam.” He uses these examples to urge his audience and all Muslims to be considerate with their enemies and to avoid other irresponsible acts. Employing Islam in his persuasive discourse was not arbitrary; when delivering the speech, Mahathir knows that his listeners are Muslims and they are highly influenced by their religion.

Economic, administration, social stability have a significant influence on the substance of Dr. Mahathir’s rhetoric. In Lines 13-15, he calls the audience to strive to improve the condition of economy, industry, administration and technology through the use of parallelism, “Our countries must be stable and well administered, must be economically and financially strong, industrially competent and technologically advanced,” which implies the social instability, weak administration and economy and lack of industrial competence in the Islamic nations. Based on these social events, he shapes his discourse to persuade the leaders of the Islamic countries and his audience to put all the necessary efforts to overcome these crises as a mechanism to make a societal change.

Extract 2 (Speech 2)

Would you kill a person whom you do not know, who had done you no wrong, in full view of everyone? Would you want to be the victim – being killed in full view of everyone with no one coming to your help because that is the code of the society that you live in? You would want to be neither. You would not want to live in a society that permits you to kill people without retribution that permits other people to kill you also without retribution. You would want to live in another society.

In Extract 2, Dr. Mahathir raises some rhetorical questions to get his audience to think logically as a means to persuade them to accept his position. For instance, he asks the questions to direct them to think deeply and to elicit an implicit response that agrees with his belief. According to Axelrod (2007), the use of rhetorical question could give the speaker a chance to shape the response he likes or intends to elicit from the listeners. What seems apparent here is that Dr. Mahathir aims to assert that no one likes or accepts killing innocent people. In fact, he even clarifies that human nature strictly rejects any society that permits killing in general. Thus, Dr. Mahathir attempts to persuade his audience by emphasizing that all people are against killing innocent people, as exercised by some superior countries.

Ethical mode (Ethos)

It is very difficult to reveal the character of the speaker if it is not supported by reasons or isolated from logical argument. Quite often, ethos is embedded behind the lines of messages. Extract 3 reflects Dr. Mahathir’s embedded ethical proofs in his messages.

Extract 3 (Speech 1)

1. The Muslims were lead by great leaders like Abdul Rahman III, AI-Mansur, Salah El Din AI Ayubi and others who took to the battlefields at the head of their forces to protect Muslim land and the ummah.
2. But halfway through the building of the great Islamic civilization came new interpreters of Islam who taught that acquisition of knowledge by Muslims meant only the study of Islamic theology. The study of science, medicine etc. was discouraged.
3. Intellectually the Muslims began to regress. With intellectual regression the great Muslim civilisation began to falter and wither. But for the
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10 emergence of the Ottoman warriors, Muslim civilisation would have
disappeared with the fall of Granada in 1492.
12 The early successes of the Ottomans were not accompanied by an
13 intellectual renaissance. Instead they became more and more preoccupied
with minor issues such as whether tight trousers and peak caps were
15 Islamic, whether printing machines should be allowed or electricity used
to light mosques. The Industrial Revolution was totally missed by the
17 Muslims. And the regression continued until the British and French
18 instigated rebellion against Turkish rule brought about the downfall of the
19 Ottomans, the last Muslim world power and replaced it with European
20 colonies and not independent states as promised. It was only after World
21 War II that these colonies became independent.

It is very difficult to reveal the character of the speaker if it is not supported with
reasons or isolated from logical arguments. Quite often, ethos is embedded behind the lines of
messages. Garver (2004) suggests that a character is not only revealed by the choices one
makes to appear ethical, but it also lies in the lines of reasoning that one does not even
consider.

Seemingly, extract 3 is a blend of logical and ethical proofs. Logical proofs are
presented by the examples of past events from the Islamic history. However, generally, the
above extract projects Dr. Mahathir’s character as a character of good sense, which
demonstrates him as knowledgeable about the history of Islam. This extract also presents Dr.
Mahathir as a critic and a homiletician who criticizes the new interpreters for their
misinterpretation of Islam, which subsequently affects Islam and causes regression. This can
be seen in Lines 4-6 when he verbalized, “but halfway through the building of the great
Islamic civilization came new interpreters of Islam who taught that acquisition of knowledge
by Muslims meant only the study of Islamic theology”. At the same time, the discourse
projects him as a preacher and critic who ascribed the Islamic deterioration to the
misinterpretation of Islamic principles and to the concern given to minor issues. In lines 14-
15, he gave examples of these minor issues when he utters, “whether tight trousers and peak
caps were Islamic or not, whether printing machines should be allowed or electricity used to
light mosques” and blames them for neglecting major issues, such as science, industry and
technology. Dr. Mahathir’s utilization of the ethical proofs is implied by the messages sent by
him, which reflect his competence and ability to provide concise knowledge and examples
from the past.

Dr. Mahathir is proud that the world of Islam had a glorious past and he believes that
Islam’s success is in the material, intellectual, cultural and scientific fields (Khoo, 2003). On
the contrary, Dr. Mahathir is currently disappointed with the situation of the Muslim nations
asserting that they are the most backward people in arts and sciences and that they are unable
to do anything by or for themselves. At this point, his discourse about Islam showed that he
held the wrong perception of the Islamic world. He frequently mentions how the Muslim
countries fall into the hands of enemies because of the weakness and deficiency of the
Muslims in science, knowledge and economy. He attributes this situation to the
misinterpretation of Islam, criticizing the clerics for confining Islam to religious studies. He
asserts that the Muslims are unable to present Islam as a religion, which is responsive to the
concerns of modern man. Instead, according to his view, the Muslims concentrate on
insignificant matters and on appearances and forms. According to Khoo (2003), Dr. Mahathir
asserts repeatedly that when the Muslims are equipped with learning, knowledge, technology,
skills and capabilities, they can regain the essence of Islam.
In the extract above, Dr. Mahathir provided two examples from the history of Islam from different contexts to relate his rhetorical evidence for social events. He provides a positive example from the age of the great leaders, namely; Abdul Rahman III, AI-Mansur, Salah El Din, AlAyubi and others, who were halfway of establishing the Islamic civilization, and another negative example from the age of the Ottomans who were preoccupied with minor religious things rather than the industry and intellect which caused deterioration for the Islamic civilization. These two rhetorical examples from different social contexts illustrate how the misunderstanding of the Islamic religion has caused the Muslim civilization to “falter and wither” (Line 9).

**Extract 4 (Speech 2)**

1. The nuclear powers are saying that only they can be trusted to possess nuclear weapons. Why? Is it because they are sensible, humane people who would not use their nuclear weapons. Can we trust them? Look at the carnage they caused with their so-called conventional weapons. They have not hesitated to kill hundreds of thousands of people with their conventional weapons. Would they not use their safe nuclear weapons which can kill probably a smaller number of people. Would this not start a nuclear war!
2. Their willingness to use depleted uranium which is a nuclear weapon is not reassuring about their not using their 10,000 nuclear warheads against others.
3. It is even less reassuring when we know they are adding to their nuclear arsenal more and better nuclear weapons. Despite the Nuclear Test Ban the US is still testing.

Extract 4 above combines both logical appeal and ethical appeal. The reasons used in this extract are to support the ethos produced by the speaker. Hauser (2002) points out that the moral habits of the rhetor are inferred by the audience from the reasons offered by the rhetor in order to support his claims and the causes he believes in. In the extract above, ethos is embedded in the messages conveyed by Dr. Mahathir. The overall argument in this extract reflects Dr. Mahathir’s goodwill and his concern of others. His ethical appeal can be observed from phrases such as “look at the carnage they caused” in Line 3 and “they have not hesitated to kill hundreds of thousands of people” in Line 4. The use of these phrases shows Dr. Mahathir’s rejection and his absolute refusal to killing people, which reflects his beliefs and consideration for others. His embedded ethical appeal was supported by logical arguments. He shows his wariness when he says “the willingness to use depleted uranium which is a nuclear weapon is not reassuring about their not using their 10000 nuclear warheads against others”. Dr. Mahathir’s anxiety about people’s lives enhances the use of ethos as a persuasive device to inculcate conviction in listener’s mind.

**Emotional mode (Pathos)**

Cockcroft and Cockcroft (2005, p. 57) claims that emotion is the “raw material” of rhetoric, because without real emotion, effective persuasion is unlikely to take place, whatever the issue involved. In the extract below Dr. Mahathir actuate his listeners’ emotions.

**Extract 5 (Speech 1)**

1. Today we, the whole Muslim ummah are treated with contempt and dishonor. Our religion is denigrated. Our holy places desecrated. Our countries are occupied. Our people starved and killed.
2. None of our countries are truly independent. We are under pressure to conform to our oppressors' wishes about how we should behave, how we
should govern our lands, how we should think even.

Today if they want to raid our country, kill our people, destroy our villages and towns, there is nothing substantial that we can do. Is it Islam which has caused all these? Or is it that we have failed to do our duty according to our religion?

In Extract 5 above, Dr. Mahathir does not hesitate to criticize the West for their endless war against the Muslim world and for their policy of economy which is unpromising towards the poor and developing countries. In addition, Khoo (2003) notes that in 1980s, a recession started in the powerful countries and then swept across the globe causing extreme hard times for developing countries. For Mahathir, this was not the result of God’s acts but the deeds of the powerful countries. Dr. Mahathir accuses the West for manipulating the Islamic world and the poor countries. Furthermore, in this extract he employs rhetorical devices to reflect the West’s dominance exercised upon the Muslim countries. He provokes his audience’s by using parallelism in Lines 2-3 when he says “our religion is denigrated. Our holy places desecrated. Our countries are occupied. Our people starved and killed.” The utilization of this parallelism aims to arouse the feeling of jealousy about religion and holy places, and the feelings of compassion and empathy with the starved and killed people. Dr. Mahathir also expresses parallelism using the infinitive in Line 7 when he says “to raid our country, kill our people, destroy our villages and towns” to show the inability of the Muslims to defend themselves. In addition to arouse the emotion of the audience, the use of parallelism serves to give the argument more power and preciseness.

Dr. Mahathir also uses rhetorical questions as a technique to support his claims and his emotional proofs. The two rhetorical questions at the end of the extract in Lines 8-9 are employed to appeal to his audience’s logic, urging them to scrutinize the reasons that led to backwardness of the Muslims and to persuade them to do their duty according to the religion’s instructions.

As a whole, Dr. Mahathir employs emotional proofs, parallelism and rhetorical questions in this extract to demonstrate the circumstances and obstacles surrounding the Islamic world. He designates the political and societal problems which undermine progress in the Islamic countries and make them unable to protect themselves or even to decide independently. He shows his dissatisfaction with the disconcerting social events going on in the Islamic world as a tool to push the audience to move for a change.

Extract 6 (Speech 2)

Dr. Mahathir brings to the minds of his audience the non-humanitarian consequences of the war on Iraq and creates a brutish image for the situation in Iraq where people are humiliated, tortured and treated harshly. Thus, to demonstrate the consequences of the
violence of war on Iraqi society, Dr. Mahathir employs emotional proof as evident in the following statements: “bestiality, old brutish, people being taken prisoners, being tortured, humiliated, treated like animals” (Lines 4-6). He uses these emotional words and phrases to trigger the feeling of anger, stir the listeners’ resentment and gain their sympathy as an attempt to attain persuasion. He uses the simile “treated like animals” (Line 7) to arouse resentment and compassion as a way to influence his audience. Sheldon (2004, pp. 288-289) emphasizes that the speaker should know in advance the type of feelings he intends to arouse in order to become persuasive in his speech. For instance, he should know whether he wants listeners to feel emphatic or angry, or whether he wants them to feel compassionate or resentful as a result of an ongoing condition or situation.

All the aforementioned emotional words, phrases and similes are associated with the socio-political events in Iraq and in this case, they are used to demonstrate the massive suppression and humiliation caused by wars. By and large, Dr. Mahathir employs his rhetorical devices to condemn the hegemonic policy of the US and its allies and appeals to listeners to criminalize wars.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION
This section provides an overall summary of the findings of the study, which highlights the rhetorical devices employed by Dr. Mahathir. The summary discusses the findings of the research questions in sequence.

Research Question 1: How are logos, ethos and pathos utilized in the speeches of Dr. Mahathir to achieve persuasion?
The logical, emotional and ethical modes found to be used in Dr. Mahathir’s discourse are summarized in Table 2.

Lucas (2009) states that people are suspicious of unsupported generalizations and they want speakers to justify their claims and provide evidence to prove that they are right. Accordingly, Dr. Mahathir utilized different rhetorical materials to support his logical claims such as examples, rhetorical questions, reasons, and facts from past events and history. Osborn et al. (2009) mention that there are rhetorical strategies that can be employed to solicit the actual participation of the audience and this participation might not require a direct response from the audience. A rhetorical question, for example, is a technique which can be used to promote the tacit participation of the audience. Similarly, the findings revealed that rhetorical questions were employed in conformity with what is emphasized by Osborn above and were used to stir listeners to think logically. The use of rhetorical questions allowed Dr. Mahathir to shape the response he wanted to elicit from his audience towards achieving the effect of persuasion.

Parallel structure and repetition are easy to follow and to remember long afterward and they help to evoke actions (Engleberg & Daly, 2009; Zarefsky, 2008). Dr. Mahathir made use of parallelism and repetition to add conciseness and clarity to his argument (see Extracts 1 and 5 for example).

The emotional mode intends to make listeners feel sad, angry, guilty, afraid, happy, proud, sympathetic or the like. The findings of this study revealed that Dr. Mahathir’s rhetorical messages were not devoid of emotion as a tool to persuade. His persuasive ability resides in his capability to blend his logical argument with emotions to address his audience’s hearts and minds. The discourse manifested his endeavors to arouse different types of feelings such as anger, sympathy, jealousy, resentment and compassion. Humiliation and oppression were also projected in the discourse to arouse the audience’s emotion of compassion and
sympathy. Parallelism and repetition are examples of the rhetorical techniques which were employed to produce emotional messages to win the audiences’ hearts.

Table 2. Logical, Emotional and Ethical modes used by Dr Mahathir

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Device</th>
<th>Application/Qualities</th>
<th>Extract No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logical Mode (Logos)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facts and reason</td>
<td>to support the argument</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhetorical examples</td>
<td>to adduce past events to support claims</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetitions</td>
<td>to make the argument more concise and to emphasize</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parallelisms</td>
<td>to reinforce arguments and ideas effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rhetorical questions</td>
<td>to elaborate more and make the audience think critically/to shape the response he wanted to elicit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Emotional Mode (Pathos)**                  |                                                            |             |
| to arouse anger about religion and holy places by using parallelism | 5           |
| to arouse the emotion of compassion and sympathy with starved and killed people | 5           |
| to arouse the audience’s jealousy towards religion                     | 6           |
| to arouse sympathy                                                   | 6           |
| to arouse resentment, indignation and compassion by using a simile   | 5           |

| **Ethical Mode (Ethos)**                  |                                                            |             |
| Good sense (competence)                  | knowledgeable about Islam history                          | 3           |
|                                        | competence                                                 | 3           |
|                                        | well informed, clearheaded                                  | 3, 4        |
| Good moral character (virtues)          | a person of wisdom                                          | 4           |
| Goodwill                               | considerate, concerned of others’ lives                     | 4           |
|                                        | a character of welfare                                     | 4           |

Generally, the findings indicated that Dr. Mahathir employed the rhetorical devices associating them with the ongoing social events. The application of the rhetorical devices was linked to socio-political issues such as the situation of the Muslim world, Islam and terrorism, wars, and domination by the West. The way he addressed these socio-political issues showed that ethos is a strong element in his discourse. Ethos is projected through his logos, and pathos. For example, when he spoke about the situation of the Muslim world (Extract 5), he displayed his knowledge and expertise to assess the circumstances of the Muslim world providing instructions, suggestions and resolutions which reflected his ethos. As logical evidence, Dr. Mahathir attributed the bad situation of the Muslim world to the weakness of Muslims in science, knowledge and economy and to the misinterpretation of Islam, blaming clerics who confine Islam to religious studies only disregarding major issues of the world such as economy, science and knowledge (see Extract 3). His precise evaluation of the situation of the Muslim world, his ideas and arguments, and his application of directives and assertives reflected his efficiency and knowledge as elements of his ethical proofs.

“Ethos does not refer to the innate character traits, those at the core of a person’s identity but it refers to the character attributed to a speaker by listeners on the basis of what the speaker says and does in the speech” (Zarefsky, 2008, p. 29). It is the character that the
speaker projects by which listeners form an impression about the speaker. Dr. Mahathir showed his credibility by helping listeners to form a favorable impression of his competence (good sense), goodwill and virtue. It was found that his ethical proofs were not stated explicitly but were embedded in his logical and emotional proofs. His arguments and messages implicitly projected him as competent, well informed, even-handed, and concerned of others’ welfare (see Extracts 3 and 4). His competence was reflected in the discourse by his knowledge, and the display of awareness on the topics addressed. As a way to project his goodwill, he showed that he is not self-centered and thinks and acts in terms of what is good for his community. All these were indicators which support the application of ethical proofs in his argument.

Research Question 2: Which mode of persuasion functions as a central device in his speeches?
It was noted that Dr. Mahathir mainly focused on gaining his audience’s trust as he knows that the audience’s trust leads to accepting and adapting his thoughts. Hence, he resorted to employ logos and pathos to highlight his ethos (competence and goodwill) as a way to gain his audience trust. The three proofs were used interdependently. Ethical proofs were embedded within the logical messages produced by Dr. Mahathir as well as in the emotional messages. Through the utilization of the logical proofs, Dr. Mahathir was able to show his competence and knowledge as elements of ethos. Similarly, through emotional proofs he was able to show his goodwill and concern for the welfare of others as an ethical proof. Although there was a complementary relationship between the three appeals of persuasion, ethical proofs in particular (that is Dr. Mahathir’s ethos as a person of competence and knowledge, and of goodwill and concern of the welfare of others) appeared to be a strength in his persuasive discourse.

Dr. Mahathir’s logos was also evident when he raised the issue of terrorism as a socio-political issue thereby claiming that terrorism is a consequence of the misinterpretation of Islam. His ethos was substantiated by his thoughts, ideas, and evidence from the history of Islam that were presented in his logical argument. Further, his thoughts which were employed to remind the audience that Islam enjoined Muslims to live peacefully with others indicated his goodwill and concern of the lives of people in general. His arguments, his confident instructions and commands depicted him as a homiletician, as a person who is knowledgeable on the Islamic religion and history (see Extract 1). Logically speaking, he argued that the Muslims understood Islam superficially and concentrated on secondary issues instead of equipping themselves with knowledge, technology, science and skills which are primary (see Extract 3). In other words, the persuasive argument presented by Dr. Mahathir asserted that Muslims were unable to present Islam as a religion which is responsive to the concerns of modern man. He appealed to the Muslims to think in a different way, in a way that matches the new world and enhances prosperity and progress. Based on Dr. Mahathir’s arguments, it is drawn that his logical proofs reflected his good sense (competence and knowledge) and his goodwill (his concern for the welfare of others), which are essential elements of the ethical proofs.

Ethos is again seen as a strong component of his argument when he articulated his confrontation with the West. It is his ethos (i.e. competence, expertise, self-confidence, knowledge) that enabled him to highlight the West’s policies and to criticize their tactics, which aim to dominate the developing countries. It is also his ethos that placed him in a position to advance logical evidence to reveal that wars are invented by the West in order to destabilize the developing countries and undermine their efforts towards progress. It is his knowledge and competence that enabled him to present logical justifications for his claim that
the West particularly the United States are violating human rights by killing many innocents in wars that were encouraged by them (see Extract 5).

The novel finding of this study is in its discovery of the rhetoric of a non-Western orator (Dr. Mahathir Mohamad) whose rhetoric was in employing logos and pathos to affect ethos as a persuasive mean. Additionally, the contribution of the study to the field of rhetoric is not only for its insights of the rhetoric of a non-Western leader but also in how one mode of persuasion (i.e. ethos) can dominate the other two (logos and pathos) to create a persuasive effect.

**CONCLUSION**

Crises are stressful and demanding by nature. Leaders are expected to react to the situational crises and need to communicate about the events to the people. The ability to successfully respond to the situation is dependent at least in part, on the rhetorical ability of the leader. Competence in communication makes a difference in one’s success in emerging as an effective leader. Dr. Mahathir was a competent and cogent orator. His success as a persuasive orator can be attributed to his overwhelming reliance on the application of numerous rhetorical devices and techniques as tools to influence his listeners to attain persuasion. From his arguments, the interrelatedness of the three modes of persuasion logos, pathos and ethos is apparent. His argumentation displayed ethos as a strong element of persuasion and as a tool to alter attitude and behaviour. His precise application of logos and pathos connoted his competence, awareness, knowledge and his apprehension for the welfare of others as components of his ethos.

In sum, rhetoric is never simply the transmission of information; rather it is the interpretation of information (Campbell, 1972). Rhetoric gives an evaluation and asks the listener to see or feel as the rhetorician does. It takes place through well-structured logos, pathos and ethos. In the case of Dr. Mahathir it is ethos that dominates his persuasive discourse.
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